

- (2) as in Lynch & Duellman.
- (3) to place the specific name *eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, as published in the combination *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) to place the generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838 (gender: masculine, type species by monotypy, *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a junior primary homonym of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, and an invalid senior subjective synonym of *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES FOR
NYMPHULA SCHRANK, 1802. Z.N.(S.)2384
 (see vol. 39, pp. 209–212)

By W. Speidel (*Gerwigstrasse 18, D-7500 Karlsruhe 1, West Germany*)

I support the application of Fletcher & Nye, 1982, concerning the species best known as *Nymphula stagnata* (Donovan, 1806).

In 1793 Hübner first published a figure of this species under the name *Phalaena potamogalis*. Unfortunately, this was a misidentification of *Phalaena potamogalis* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775, which is an unjustified emendation of *Phalaena (Geometra) potamogata* Linnaeus, 1758, a completely different species now considered to be synonymous with *Phalaena (Geometra) nymphaeata* Linnaeus, 1758.

When Schrank described his genus *Nymphula*, he included a species *potamogalis* in the sense of Hübner, 1793 and 1796 and it was this species that Moore, 1887, cited as the type species of the genus. The valid specific name for this species is *stagnata* Donovan, 1806, and Fletcher & Nye were quite right to ask the Commission to designate that species as the type species of *Nymphula*. This corresponds with Schrank's and Moore's concept of the genus.

Account must, however, be taken of *Phalaena nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767 (pp. 618–619) from the vicinity of Berlin, which was placed in the synonymy of *Nymphula nymphaealis* Treitschke, 1829, non [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 by Treitschke. This is the same species as *Phalaena stagnata* Donovan. The description by [Hufnagel] strongly supports Treitschke's interpretation: '*Phalaena nitidulata*, Der Wasservogel. Schneeweiss mit einigen irregulären hellbraunen Zeichnungen. Aufenthalt der Phaläne bei Gewässern im Grase. Zeit der Phaläne Julius und August. Grösse der Phaläne von der dritten. Selten.' [Hufnagel] also described *Phalaena nymphaeata* as being 'of the third size', which was his way of giving the relative size of each species. We cannot be completely sure of the identity of [Hufnagel's] species except by reference to Treitschke's interpretation.

In order to avoid any confusion, and to conserve a well-known name, I ask the Commission to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767, as published in the binomen *Phalaena nitidulata*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- [HUFNAGEL], 1767. Fortsetzung der Tabelle von den Nachtvögeln, welche die 3te Art derselben, nemlich die Spannenmesser (*Phalaenas Geometras Linnaei*) enthält. *Berlinisches Mag.*, vol. 4 (6), pp. 599–626.
- SPEIDEL, W. 1983. The Acentropinae (Lepidoptera Crambidae) from Spain and Portugal. *SHILAP Revta lepid.*, vol. 11, pp. 83–86.
- TREITSCHKE, F. 1829. *Die Schmetterlinge von Europa*, vol. 7. Leipzig, 252 pp.
- MOORE, F. 1884–1887. *The Lepidoptera of Ceylon*, vol. 3. London, 578 pp., pls 144–215.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *LASPEYRESIA*
HÜBNER, [1825]. Z.N.(S.)2421
(see vol. 41, pp. 110–113)

- (1) By R. W. Hodges (*Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.*)

The following view of Dr Kuznetsov and Dr Kerzhner's case for the suppression of *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is given for the Commission's consideration before a decision is taken:

1. *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817;
2. The oldest synonym of *Laspeyresia* Hübner [1825] is *Cydia* Hübner, [1825];
3. *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is the valid replacement name for *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], based on priority. This argument was used and followed by Bradley, 1972 and others as indicated in paragraph 8 of Kuznetsov & Kerzhner's statement;
4. Other arguments have little relevance for the future. Either decision will cause some workers difficulty; however, the decision based on priority, the basic principle of the Code, provides for stability of nomenclature.

The following point, though not germane to my argument, should be significant to the Commission: four checklists (Bradley, 1972 in Kloet & Hincks, *Checklist of British Insects*, pt 2, Lepidoptera; Lérout, 1980, *Liste systématique et synonymique des Lépidoptères de France, Belgique et Corse*; Powell, 1983 in Hodges, *Checklist of Lepidoptera of America north of Mexico*; and Powell, in press, in Heppner, *Atlas of Neotropical Lepidoptera, Checklist, part 1*) that treat a significant part of the world's lepidopteran fauna use *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] as the valid name and cite *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] as a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

I strongly urge the Commission not to suppress *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

- (2) By William E. Miller (*University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota 55108, U.S.A.*)

As an active tortricidologist, I should like to comment on the proposal by Kuznetsov & Kerzhner to conserve *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] by suppressing *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 and *Cydia* Hübner, [1825].